

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

25th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXV, No. 14

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© September 15, 1995

## *Gallo Critics Trying to Block Appointment to Head New Lab*

The Gallo case, doused as a federal issue two years ago with the withdrawal of the government's scientific misconduct charges against the renowned virologist, is stirring in the State of Maryland, where a last-ditch effort is underway to block Gallo's appointment as Director of a new Institute of Human Virology, to be funded by the state and federal governments and the City of Baltimore.

The campaign is almost entirely the work of a mere three antagonists of Robert C. Gallo—two researchers at the National Institutes of Health, William A. Hagins and Shuko Yoshikami, and Suzanne W. Hadley, a former investigator for NIH and Congressman John Dingell. The three say they're appalled by Gallo's disputed role in the identification of the AIDS virus, and they're warning Maryland officials against signing up the long-controversial, revered and reviled Gallo.

The impact of these efforts is uncertain, since negotiations for the Institute have been underway for some time and are

## *Tobacco Study Snuffed at NCI—P. 2 OTA Loses Last-Chance Vote—P. 4*

generally reported to be proceeding satisfactorily. The campaign, however, has not gone unnoted in the Gallo camp or in the Maryland General Assembly, which must approve a \$9 million fund pledged for the Institute by Governor Glendening. An Assembly staff official told SGR last week that a request for the fund was expected earlier but has not yet been submitted to the legislative body.

In July, Gallo's lawyer threatened a libel suit against Hadley for a letter she wrote to Glendening warning him of "the decade-plus-long record of misconduct in the Gallo laboratory [at NIH]." Demanding that she stop sending such letters, attorney Joseph Onek, of the gouge-and-stomp school of legal practice, warned Hadley: "Do not believe that your modest financial resources make you immune from suit." Hadley responded: "Dear Joe, Even by your standards, your recent threatening letter was not particularly intelligent." She also wrote again to Glendening, reporting Onek's threat against her and similar threats that Onek had directed against other Gallo critics.

Last week, a senior staff official of the Maryland General Assembly, William S. Ratchford II, Director of the Department of Fiscal Services, told SGR that "the staff is reviewing" materials provided by Gallo's opponents. Ratchford serves as adviser to the 28-member Legislative Policy Committee,

(Continued on Page 3)

## *Who's Best? Massive Study Ranks PhD Programs in US*

A new bible of academic standings became available last week with the release of a massive collection of data on 3600 PhD programs in 274 American universities, with information ranging from enrollments, finances and duration to degree, to subjective measures of their "reputational ratings" by specialists in their fields.

Four years in preparation, at a cost of \$1.2 million, the new work, *Research Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change*, bears the prestigious imprimatur of the National Academy of Sciences—which means that for the winners in its tabulations, it can be golden on the grant circuit and in recruiting top students. For low-raters, the consequences may range from ouster in favor of new

(Continued on Page 2)

## *In Brief*

With a fervor usually seen only in the politically astute biomedical-research community, scientific leaders in other fields were fighting back last week against Republican R&D budget cuts and government-shrinkage plans. At a Washington press conference, letters were released from twenty-five Nobel laureates in physics and 18 presidents of scientific societies urging preservation of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, threatened by legislation to abolish the parent Department of Commerce.

Meanwhile, some 200 high-tech corporate executives, academics and researchers publicly endorsed a statement by 17 state governors for strong federal support for R&D.

Rep. George Brown, of California, top Democrat on the House Science Committee, was publicizing a letter he wrote to President Clinton urging vetoes of money bills that don't do right by science. Republicans, Brown said, have "targeted R&D initiatives as a 'cash cow' to pay for a profoundly misdirected tax cut." He also pointed out that "universities are the single largest employer in a number of large cities (Philadelphia, Boston, Seattle, Nashville) and states (California, Maryland)," adding, "In other words, the Republican R&D budget cuts will translate directly into significant job losses."

The alleged "cuts" vary widely by agency. NSF and NIH seem to be coming out of the Congressional session in pretty good shape. NASA is stressed by cuts and the high costs of the politically untouchable Space Station. DOE has so far fared well in basic research, while suffering huge reductions in most other R&D programs. Ag R&D is falling behind financially, while R&D for missile defense has undergone a renaissance at the Pentagon.

## ... Many Caveats About Interpreting the PhD Data

(Continued from Page 1)

leadership, to commitment of additional resources for a build-up. The report is the first of its kind produced by the Academy since 1982.

The release, at a press briefing September 12, was accompanied by evident pride in collecting the great mass of scattered data. Also voiced were numerous cautions about the difficulties and uncertainties of interpreting the data, derived from PhD programs in 41 fields of the physical, natural, and social sciences, and arts and humanities. Medicine, law and other professional programs were not included.

Perhaps indicative of expectations about how the report

**Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change** (740 pp., \$59.95, plus \$4 for shipping). Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; tel. 1-800/624-6242, or 202/334-3313.

Also available on the Academy's World Wide Web home page: <<http://www.nas.edu>>; a CD-ROM version is due in December.

will be used in academe and beyond, its release was accompanied by a printed sheet comparing it to the highly popular, if somewhat schlocky, annual rankings of graduate schools in *US News and World Report*.

By the Academy's own persuasive account, its product is superior in scope, methodology, and breadth of data. The co-chairman of the committee that produced the report, Marvin L. Goldberger, Dean of Natural Sciences at UC San Diego, said at the briefing that the report is expected to be useful for prospective graduate students, university administrators "faced with decisions about resource allocation," and researchers and organizations interested in "factors that contribute to the conduct and quality" of the PhD programs.

With 19 categories of data collected on each PhD program, the irresistible question of who's first in various fields defies a meaningful answer. For example, under the heading "Relative Rankings" in biochemistry and molecular biology, the listing of the first ten starts with UC San Francisco, and continues with MIT, Stanford, UC Berkeley, Harvard, Yale, Caltech, U of Wisconsin-Madison, UC San Diego, and Johns Hopkins. But among the 10, the standings vary in individual categories, such as citations to papers and numbers of faculty and students.

A member of the Goldberger committee, Stephen M. Stigler, Professor of Statistics at the University of Chicago, cautioned against the idea that "this is a tournament," adding that "who was number one in a particular program was not our goal."

One of the major findings from the study is that programmatic eminence tends to be durable in academe. Only 15 percent of the programs in the top quarter in 1982 moved downward in the latest study.

### House Kills NCI Tobacco Study

Joy over the unexpected budget increase that the House voted for the National Institutes of Health has been tempered by the realization that the money came with an edict to terminate a research project that has stirred up the tobacco industry: A study, funded by the National Cancer Institute at UC San Francisco, of the effect of tobacco campaign contributions on anti-smoking initiatives in state legislatures.

The principal investigator on the project, Professor Stanton A. Glantz, of the UCSF Cardiology Department, has unearthed extensive evidence of the industry's influence at the state level. His publications, including an article in the July 19 *JAMA*, have drawn wide attention.

Glantz had just completed the second year of a three-year, \$200,000-a-year NCI-supported study when the House Appropriations Subcommittee, in a report July 27, banned further support. With the attention of press and lobbyists focused on NIH's money woes, the passage concerning the tobacco project went unnoted, in SGR as elsewhere. But with summer season over and Congress back in action, alarm bells have been sounding over the ban, which states, in part:

While the Committee is not rendering judgment on the merits of the grant proposal, it feels strongly that such research projects do not properly fall within the boundaries of the NCI portfolio, especially when nearly three-quarters of approved research projects go unfunded. Accordingly, the Committee does not provide any further funding for this research grant within the NCI appropriation.

What's especially mysterious about all this is the role of Subcommittee Chairman John Porter (R-Ill.), widely regarded as a decent legislator with a strong commitment to health research. Porter delivered on money for NIH, but his whereabouts on the equally important issue of scientific autonomy for NCI remains cloudy.

Attention has shifted to the Senate, where an effort is underway to rescind the ban by the NIH Appropriations Subcommittee there, chaired by Senator Arlen Specter (R-Pa.).

© 1995, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager

Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$490.00 (two years, \$840.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

## ... Objections Will be Weighed, Maryland Aide Says

(Continued from Page 1)

which consists of the leaders of both houses and chairs of committees.

The Committee has authority to appropriate money from a "Sunny Day" fund for promoting economic development. Ratchford said the controversy dogging Gallo "can't be ignored. We know there are concerns among members of the scientific community about actions that, if not illegal, were questionable. People have raised questions," he said.

The materials referred to by Ratchford include a 1992 BBC television documentary, "Taking the Credit," which sympathetically presents the thesis that Gallo filched credit for identification of the AIDS virus from the Pasteur Institute. Maryland legislators have also been sent copies of a draft investigative report of the Gallo case produced by Hadley while she was working as an investigator for Rep. Dingell.

In the final stage of preparation when the Republicans took control of the House, the report was left stranded as an unwanted Democratic endeavor and has no official standing. Heavily documented and strongly critical of Gallo, it has been widely distributed by Hadley and likeminded colleagues, in print, on diskette, and on the Internet.

Following a series of investigations, findings of scientific misconduct against Gallo were issued in 1993 by the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Research Integrity. ORI concluded that to advance his own claim to priority in AIDS research, Gallo had misrepresented the accomplishments of the Pasteur Institute in a paper in *Science* in 1984.

When Gallo filed an appeal, ORI grudgingly withdrew the findings, citing newly adopted, stiffer evidentiary rules in the appeals process. In doing so, however, ORI defended its original findings against Gallo, saying he had "misstated" Pasteur's role. The ORI capitulation statement declared that the "scientific community has a low threshold of tolerance for false statements," and it pointedly lauded "the importance of clarity, accuracy, and honesty in science."

The withdrawal of the charges evoked a bitter response among some scientists acquainted with Gallo, among them Donald P. Francis, head of the AIDS laboratory at the Centers for Disease Control in the early stages of the epidemic. In a letter to ORI in December 1993, Francis wrote, "In my opinion, Dr. Gallo's behavior was disgraceful, an insult to the integrity of all scientists. Dr. Gallo purposely tried to rob the credit for the discovery of HIV-1 from the *Institut Pasteur*. It was not passive or an oversight..."

Gallo was legally cleared, but the "case" refused to die. In 1994, the Pasteur Institute, citing new documentary evidence, challenged the 1987 agreement in which President Reagan and French Premier Chirac settled the Pasteur-Gallo dispute with a diktat that evenly split the scientific credit and patent royalties from the HIV blood test. Essentially claiming that it was robbed, Pasteur asked newly installed NIH

Director Harold Varmus for a bigger share of the royalties. Varmus, after initially rejecting the request, agreed—apparently after having looked deeper into the case.

Gallo, in a telephone conversation last week with SGR, said he had no doubt that the Maryland deal would be completed, but said that if it's not, he expected no difficulty in obtaining funding elsewhere. He also denounced Hadley and company, saying that as a result of the long-running investigations, in which she was the principal investigator, "my life has been half-destroyed and my science disrupted."

Press reports in May created the impression that contractual arrangements for the Institute had been completed in a complex deal involving Gallo, the University of Maryland, the state, and the City of Baltimore. The building that will house the Institute is now under construction in a downtown Baltimore neighborhood that is part of a \$100-million federal "empowerment zone" designed to promote economic development.

The Institute itself will be part of one of four centers under the umbrella of the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute. The City of Baltimore has committed \$1 million a year for three years for the Virology Institute, part of a major development to attract biotechnology firms. The University of Maryland is to provide a similar amount of money, and Gallo has publicly expressed expectations of funding from NIH. In an interview published in *US Medicine* in July, he rhetorically asked, "And wouldn't it be a scandal if the most obvious research center for AIDS wouldn't get funded [by NIH]?"

In all the government sectors currently involved in this complex deal, SGR was told that everything is on track. But Mary Moynihan, Director of Communications for the University of Maryland Biotechnology Center, said that the deal with Gallo "is still in the final stages of negotiations. He hasn't signed anything yet."

Chuck Percori, spokesman for the State Department of Business and Economic Development, said the agreement with Gallo was "at the University level," where details were being worked out about appointments and tenure for staffers he plans to bring to the Institute. Gallo told SGR that one of them, William Blattner, an epidemiologist, has already moved from the National Cancer Institute to the new Institute. Discussing his own schedule for moving, Gallo said he was eligible for retirement from NIH on July 1, when he completed 30 years of service, but had postponed his departure to Baltimore until October 1 because of a four-month delay in construction of the Institute building.

Hagins and Yoshikami, the outspoken NIH opponents of Gallo's Baltimore appointment, told SGR that they're opposed to the move as scientists and as Maryland residents. The pair, labmates in the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, say they base their opposition on the voluminous record of multiple investigations into

(Continued on Page 4)

## For OTA, Termination—Why and How It Happened

The last, and very slim, hope of a reprieve for the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment ended September 6 when the House voted to accept an appropriations report that provides OTA only with close-down money for the coming fiscal year. Realizing the battle was over, OTA supporters had made only a brief appeal to save the agency, and then went down to defeat, 305-101.

As a result, OTA will be out of business September 30, except for a skeleton crew to finish pending reports, pack up records, and attend to other details of terminating a 23-year-old operation that at its peak had a staff of some 200.

Meanwhile, several OTA staff members and outside colleagues are seeking support to carry on OTA's role through the creation of a non-governmental, non-profit Institute for Technology Assessment. Incorporated last month in Washington, DC, the Institute would conduct studies in the OTA fashion and would also seek "to preserve the institutional memory and culture" of OTA "for at least three to five years in the hope that a later Congress may decide to refund the agency," according to a prospectus.

Listed as interim directors of the Institute are: Professor Don Kash, of the Institute of Public Policy, George Mason University; Irwin White, Head of Energy Programs, Battelle Northwest Laboratories, and Joseph Coates, President of Coates & Jarratt, Inc., a Washington, DC, consulting firm.

Until September 29, the group can be contacted: c/o Vary Coates, 3738 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC, 20015; tel. 202/228-6772; fax 202/228-6344; afterwards: tel. 202/363-8523; fax 202/966-8349.

Designated a target of internal Congressional cost-cut-

ting by the newly elected Republican majorities last fall, OTA had unexpectedly survived in the House [SGR, July 15] under a plan that would have appended it in scaled-down form to the Library of Congress. The Senate, however, rejected the rescue plan, and on July 28, a conference of the two chambers endorsed the Senate version.

The last chance for survival hung on the remote possibility that the House would stand by its original vote to keep OTA alive and would reject the conference report. But when the issue came to the House floor last week as part of a \$2.2 billion appropriations bill for Congressional salaries, operations, and other expenses, OTA's backers were unable to repeat their initial success.

There's no doubt now that OTA is done for. But the mode of elimination employed by the Congress leaves behind a statutory ghost that could be summoned into service if a reversal of political fortunes puts OTA-minded legislators back in control. The Congress voted to terminate OTA through the simple process of denying it money, but did not touch the 1972 Act of Congress which authorized the creation of OTA. Though unfunded—like many other authorized creations of Congress—the OTA legislation remains on the books. To put OTA back in business, all Congress need do is add money. In fighting the fates, OTA supporters warned that, once disassembled, it would be very difficult to put the organization back together again. But that's debatable—as well as being a hypothetical issue at this point.

In Washington science-policy circles, the pre-mortems on OTA's impending demise converge on a number of factors. For the Republicans who took over Congress with pledges of savage budget reductions, OTA was a convenient and relatively defenseless target for demonstrating that Congress would not exempt itself from frugality. Following the November election, but before the new Congress convened, the Republican Senate Caucus included OTA on a long list of targets for termination.

But the threat to OTA appeared dim and distant at that point. The agency, after all, was well-rooted in the Congressional establishment, numbering among its supporters many Republican conservatives, including Senator Orrin Hatch, a longtime member of the OTA board. Furthermore, at \$22 million this year, the OTA budget was only a sliver of annual Congressional spending.

The friends of OTA sensed danger but figured that the agency would weather the political storm, with perhaps a reduced budget as a sop to its critics. Prominent among the latter was Senator Connie Mack (R-Fla.), Chairman of OTA's Appropriations Subcommittee. Early on, Mack expressed determination to wipe out OTA, describing it as duplicative of other research organizations in Congress and elsewhere. But since Mack had no known grievance about OTA, his threats were regarded as mere Senatorial bombast.

However, as the new management on Capitol Hill became

(Continued on Page 5)

### **Gallo** (Continued from Page 3)

Gallo's claims of achievement in AIDS research.

Hagins, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, wrote to Governor Glendening in May, immediately following public announcement of Gallo's Baltimore appointment. "As your staff should have told you," Hagins wrote, "Dr. Gallo's reputation is under a very dark moral cloud." Referring to the report Hadley wrote while working for Dingell, and various other documents, Hagins stated that Gallo's "association with the Institute of Virology in *any capacity* would be contrary to the interests of the taxpayers and voters of Maryland and would be a sorry contribution to the fight against AIDS. What honest business would want to invest in such a disreputable enterprise?"

In letters to members of the General Assembly, Yoshikami summarized critical reports from several federal investigations of Gallo and particularly urged them to read Hadley's report, diskette enclosed.

Hagins and Yoshikami said they haven't tried to enlist other scientists in their cause—and, in fact, said they don't think they would be successful if they tried. "People are cautious," Hagins said, adding, "You don't get anything out of a squabble."—DSG



## ... New Republican Majorities Needed a Victim

(Continued from Page 4)

acquainted with the fiscal and operational realities of the multi-billion dollar legislative branch, the difficulties of achieving high-visibility money-saving moves became apparent. Large cuts in the office staffs and committees of Congress were promptly implemented, but such moves did not fulfill the often-made promise to pull something or other on Congress's own turf "up by the roots."

At one point, there was talk about selling the building that the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) occupies at the foot of Capitol Hill. But the CBO, whose budget tallies and forecasts are indispensable for the appropriations process, warned that relocation would not only disrupt crucial work but would also entail large costs for moving computer equipment recently installed on a specially reinforced upper floor. CBO's building was left untouched. By a process of elimination, OTA emerged as the leading candidate for rooting out. But that was not all that made it a target.

In the view of the ebullient new Republican majorities, OTA had a Democratic pedigree, even though it was governed by a House-Senate board evenly divided between the two parties. Democrats had created OTA in 1972 as an analytical weapon for dealing with the evasive Nixon White House. After a dismal start in which it tried to serve all comers, OTA finally settled down to a style of operation that suited the powers on Capitol Hill. To avoid scattershotting its efforts on study requests from individual members of Congress, OTA evolved a style of working with committee chairmen—Democrats throughout virtually all of OTA's existence. All requests for studies had to come from a committee chairman, though OTA made perfunctory nods to the ranking opposition members. The strategy of working closely with the chairmen was the work of OTA's longest-serving Director, John Gibbons, who, Republicans noted, moved to the White House on Inauguration Day to serve as Bill Clinton's Assistant for Science and Technology.

In the end, OTA's strongest supporters were Democrats who had been deposed from chairmanships by the November election results.

The incoming class of 11 Senators and 87 Representatives was little acquainted, if at all, with OTA, as were many others in both houses. To the many admirers of OTA, including members of the scientific community who have served OTA as expert consultants, the ignorance may seem astounding. But OTA, for all its scholarly distinction and unique role as Congress's own think tank, was regarded by many as just one among hordes of organizations that deluge Congress with weighty reports claiming expert standing.

When the amendment to save OTA was first considered in the House, a fourth-term Democratic Member, seeking to do the right thing, telephoned SGR with a brief question: "What the hell is OTA?"

The final verdict on OTA, contained in the Legislative Appropriations Bill, must still be endorsed by the Senate and

### A Few More OTA Reports

A terminal trickle of publications coming out of OTA includes the following:

**A History of the Department of Defense Federally Funded Research and Development Centers** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01420-3; 68 pp., \$5.50), reviews the origins, roles, staffing, budgets, etc., of Pentagon-supported research centers, including RAND, MITRE, the Aerospace Corporation, the Center for Naval Analyses, and the Institute for Defense Analyses.

**Effectiveness and Costs of Osteoporosis Screening and Hormone Replacement Therapy, Volume I, Cost-Effectiveness Analysis** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01423-8; 61 pp., \$4.75); **Volume II, Evidence on Benefits, Risks, and Costs** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01424-6; 229 pp., \$15), assesses the data on detection, treatment, and costs. Earlier OTA publications on the subject are listed.

**The Lower Tiers of the Space Transportation Industrial Base** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01425-4; 25 pp., \$2.50), looks at space suppliers below the level of prime contractors and finds many in precarious condition as a result of defense and space budget reductions.

Order from: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512-2250. Add 25 percent for foreign orders.

Also available, directly from OTA and without charge, are brief background reports from work in progress when the ax fell, including the following:

**Environmental Technology: Analysis of Selected Federal R&D Programs** (57 pp.), describes federal agency programs devoted to the development and application of environmental technologies, and estimates their costs at nearly \$4.5 billion in fiscal 1994.

**Coverage of Laser Technology by Health Insurers** (40 pp.), reports on a survey of private insurers concerning criteria for coverage decisions for laser angioplasty, laser dissection, and photodynamic therapy.

Order from: Office of Technology Assessment, US Congress, Washington, DC 20510-8025; for telephone orders, through September 29: 202/224-8996; after that, not known at press time.

signed by the President. The bill funding Congress is the first to come out of the appropriations mill, and there's been talk that the President might perform a grandstanding veto, admonishing Congress for looking after itself before attending to the nation's needs.

With or without a veto, there's no money next year for OTA, except for \$6 million for severance pay and other termination expenses. In expectation of the end, the staff has been dribbling away to other jobs. For those who are still looking, the close-down legislation provides for 60 days of severance pay.

## News Notes: \$400,000 Prize, S&T Immigration, Etc.

Engineering's richest professional honor, the \$400,000 Charles Stark Draper Prize, will be awarded September 27 in Washington during the annual meeting of the National Academy of Engineering. Winner, or winners, to be revealed then. The prize, given every other year, was first awarded in 1989. The meeting will also hear the first Presidential address of NAE chief Harold Liebowitz, elected in April in an upset over the opposition of NAE's inner circle.

Total immigration declined in 1993, but not for scientists and engineers. Their numbers rose to 23,534, an increase of 3.1 percent from 1992. Mathematical scientists and computer specialists accounted for nearly half the S&E admissions. The data, from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, are reported by NSF in a two-page *Data Brief* (Vol. 1995, No. 11), available, without charge, from: NSF, Division of Science Resources Studies, Suite 965, Arlington, Va., 22230; tel. 703/306-1773; fax 703/306-0510; E-mail: <databrief@nsf.gov>.

### Job Changes & Appointments

**Laura Skirboll**, Director of the Office of Science Policy and Program Planning at the National Institute of Mental Health, has been appointed Associate Director for Science Policy at NIH. The appointment is to a reconfigured position formerly held on an acting basis by **Sandy Chamblee**, who left NIH last month.

**Story C. Landis**, Chairman of the Department of Neurosciences at Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, has been appointed Scientific Director of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke.

**Bernadine Healy**, Director of NIH from 1991-93, takes over September 25 as Dean of the College of Medicine at Ohio State University. Post-NIH, Healy ran unsuccessfully for the Republican nomination for the US Senate in Ohio, and then returned to the Cleveland Clinic Foundation. Her political ambitions are reportedly unquenched, but the next race for the Senate in Ohio won't take place until 1998, when Democrat John Glenn's term expires. In any Republican Administration short of the far right, Healy would probably make the short list for Secretary of Health and Human Services. At Ohio State, she succeeds **Manuel Tzagournis**, who also held the job of Vice President for Health Services, a title he'll retain with expanded responsibilities.

At the National Science Foundation, **Julia A. Moore** has been appointed Director of the Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, NSF's senior post for lobbying Congress and rallying public support for science. Moore had been serving since 1991 as Executive Director of Physicians for Social Responsibility, a Washington-based organization of some 20,000 health professionals dedicated to environmental protection, prevention of violence, arms control, etc.

**Joel Widder**, who was holding the NSF job on an acting basis, will serve as Deputy Director for Legislative and Public

The surge of applicants for medical-school admission continues, with the current crop, 46,514—in quest of some 16,000 slots—setting a record for the third straight year, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges. Why, when other professional fields are slumping? More college students, more science enrollments, and relatively poor job prospects elsewhere account for some of it, says AAMC President Jordan J. Cohen, adding that for many applicants, the national-health care debate “has been more invigorating than disenchanting.”

Testimony was winding up last week in the so-called Baltimore case—involving charges of scientific misconduct against Thereza Imanishi-Kari, a former colleague of Nobelist David Baltimore [SGR, June 1]. Her challenge to the charges has been heard by the Departmental Appeals Board of the Department of Health and Human Services. The next step is likely to be post-hearing briefings by attorneys. A decision in the case is expected no sooner than early next year.

Affairs, and will continue as NSF's chief representative on Capitol Hill. **Raymond E. Bye Jr.**, Moore's predecessor in the NSF post, received a full-fledged appointment last month as Associate Vice President for Research at Florida State University, where he had been serving on an interim basis while on terminal leave from NSF.

Also at NSF: **Julius Jackson**, Professor of Microbiology at Michigan State University, has been appointed Director of the Division of Molecular and Cellular Biosciences. The appointment is under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, which provides for temporary exchanges between federal and non-government organizations.

And **William P. Butz**, Associate Director for Demographic Programs at the US Bureau of the Census, has been appointed Director of NSF's Division of Social, Behavioral and Economic Research. The Division is the big item in a similarly named NSF Directorate that has evoked ideological animosity in House Republican circles, but so far the Directorate has eluded the ax.

**Paul Griner**, Professor of Medicine at the University of Rochester and former Chief Executive of Strong Memorial Hospital, has been appointed head of the newly established Center for the Assessment and Management of Change in Academic Medicine of the Association of American Medical Colleges, Washington-based lobby for medical education.

**James W. Curran**, Associate Director for HIV/AIDS at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, has been appointed Dean of the Emory University School of Public Health.

**Howard Gobstein**, a Senior Policy Analyst in the Science Division of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, has been appointed Washington representative of Michigan State University. Gobstein formerly was a Vice President of the Association of American Universities.

## In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

### From the Environmental Law Institute (ELI):

**NEPA Deskbook: 2d Edition** (443 pp., \$69.95, plus \$4 for shipping), updates the ELI's original 1989 collection of analyses, judicial opinions, executive orders, agency regulations, etc. concerning the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969, the statutory foundation of modern environmentalism. The volume leads off with a commentary by Nicholas C. Yost, General Counsel of the Council on Environmental Quality in the Carter Administration, now practicing environmental law in San Francisco. The ELI, a Washington-based non-profit research and education organization, says the *Deskbook* is intended for attorneys concerned with environmental matters and other "environmental professionals." Also available (no charge): *ELI Publications Catalog*, listing other "deskbooks," research reports, monographs, etc.

Order from: Environmental Law Institute, 1616 P St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036; tel. 1-800/433-5120 or 202/939-3844; fax 202/328-5002, Attn. Orders.

### From the NIH Alumni Association:

**NIHAA Update** (twice-yearly, 30-40 pp., \$35 per year), a non-government newsletter for alumni of NIH and others interested in the institution, its programs and problems, and staff, past and present. The Association, numbering 1900 members, is headed by former NIH Associate Director for Administration Calvin Baldwin Jr., who recently succeeded Thomas J. Kennedy Jr., former NIH Associate Director for Program Planning and Evaluation. Harriet R. Greenwald is Editor of *Update*, which dates in its present form from the NIH centennial, in 1987.

Order from: NIHAA Office, 9101 Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda, Md. 20814-1616; tel. 301/530-0567.

### From the Department of Energy, no charge:

**Human Radiation Experiments Associated with the US Department of Energy and its Predecessors** (213 pp.), another product of the DOE come-clean program instituted by Secretary Hazel O'Leary, this one summarizes 435 experiments and studies, involving 16,000 subjects, back to World War II. Also available, a related report issued in February: **Human Radiation Experiments: The Department of Energy Roadmap to the Story and the Records** (299 pp.).

Order from: Department of Energy, Public Inquiries Office, Washington, DC 20585; tel. 202/586-5575; fax 202/586-2976. The above plus additional material also available on the Internet: <http://www.ohre.doe.gov>

**Benefits & Breakthroughs** (4 pp.), a new quarterly newsletter, from DOE's Office of Industrial Technologies, teeming with cheerful, newsy reports of linkups between DOE and industry.

Order from: Benefits and Breakthroughs, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 1617 Cole Boulevard, attn. Nicki Malenfant, Golden, Colorado 80401-3393; tel. 303/275-3632; fax 303/275-3619.

**The State-Federal Technology Partnership Task Force: Final Report** (29 pp., no charge), recommendations for expanding collaboration between the two sectors, based on a study commissioned by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). Chaired by former Governors Richard Celeste of Ohio and Dick Thornburgh of Pennsylvania, the Task Force calls for creation of a "high-level state-federal advisory mechanism" to coordinate and implement S&T policy; beefing up of state roles in S&T, and expanded state-federal efforts to provide technical assistance for business and industry. With a bare federal purse limiting opportunities for new starts, the promotion of inexpensive state-federal efforts drew attention in the latter days of the Bush Administration and was warmly embraced by the Clinton White House. Teaming up with OSTP in this exercise were the Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology, and Government; the National Governors' Association; the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, and the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Order from: The State-Federal Technology Partnership Task Force, attn. Chris Coburn, 25000 Great Northern Corporate Center, Suite 260, Cleveland, Ohio 44070; tel. 216/734-0094; fax 216/734-0686; E-mail: [coburnc@battelle.org](mailto:coburnc@battelle.org)

### From the Library of Congress:

**Neuroscience, Memory, and Language** (GPO Stock No. 030-001-00149-1; 160 pp., \$26), papers from symposia sponsored in 1992-93 by the Library and the National Institute of Mental Health in connection with President Bush's declaration of the Decade of the Brain. Contributors include Gerald Edelman, Richard Broadwell, Lewis Judd, Charles F. Stevens, and Eric Kandel.

Order from: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512-2250.

## To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station, Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$490.00 ☐  
two years, \$840.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$40.00 per year; non-USA surface  
mail, \$20.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# \_\_\_\_\_ Exp. date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970  
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

# In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

## From the American Association for the Advancement of Science:

**Interim Report on Congressional Appropriations for R&D in FY 1996** (43 pp., \$8.50 plus \$1 for shipping), a well-done midterm report that pulls together Congressional appropriations actions on research-related budgets for fiscal 1996, as of Congress's early-August departure for a month-long recess. Focused mainly on the House, which customarily moves first on appropriations, the report shows non-defense R&D down by 5.2 percent from the current year, with most of the damage concentrated in industrial-technology, space, environment, and energy programs. As voted by the House, overall basic research spending would rise by 1.6 percent, but the bump occurs mainly because of an unexpected 5.7 percent increase for NIH (vulnerable to shrinkage in the Senate), while elsewhere the money prospects are flat or worse. The durability of the House numbers is doubtful, given different spending priorities in the Senate, which is now working on its money decisions; and then there are veto threats from the White House, which is balking at Republican cuts in social programs that, unfortunately for science, are legislatively packaged with unrelated R&D items. Reflecting the scientific community's jitters over Congressional budget intentions, the *Interim Report* is a new venture for the AAAS, which heretofore has confined its budget reports to a pre-game analysis of the President's R&D spending plans and a post-mortem at the end of the Congressional session. The new report was released August 29 at a Washington meeting attended by an unexpectedly large crowd of over 300 R&D apparatchiks, many bubbling with gallows humor. But more important than rallying the gloomy faithful, the report scored well in science's campaign to sway public opinion against Congressional budget cuts. Published when Washington was in the news doldrums, it received major play in the national press, including the *New York Times*, which headlined its account: "Budget Cuts Seen by Science Group as Very Harmful for US Research."

Order from: AAAS, Directorate for Science and Policy Programs, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/326-660; fax 202/289-4950; e-mail: science\_policy@aaas.org

## From the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development:

**Main Science and Technology Indicators: 1995 I** (twice yearly, 78 pp., \$42; on diskette, \$125), statistics on R&D expenditures, employment, patents, royalties, educational enrollments, etc. in the 25 OECD nations, with text in English and French. The data, collected by OECD from the research and statistical agencies of member countries, are of variable reality and comparability. But once enshrined in the

OECD tables, they become gospel and are particularly handy for thrashing one's own government for relative neglect of research. The publication lists other OECD statistical series on R&D, in print and on diskettes.

Order from: OECD Publications and Information Center, 2001 L St. NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-4910; tel. 202/785-6323; fax 202/785-0350; also available from bookshops and OECD offices in major cities around the world.

**From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:**  
**Hazardous and Nonhazardous Waste: Demographics of People Living Near Waste Facilities** (GAO/RCED-95-84; 120 pp.), based on analysis of census data, concludes that racial minorities and low-income families are not overrepresented in the vicinities of non-hazardous municipal landfills. But the GAO says studies of populations near hazardous sites produced "varied conclusions" that left it unsure about exposures. The report, requested by Senator John Glenn, of Ohio, ranking Democrat on the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, was inspired by concerns about "environmental justice," which federal agencies were directed to pursue in a Presidential Executive Order issued last year.

**Information Technology Investment: A Governmentwide Overview** (GAO/AIMD-95-208; 29 pp.), catalogs spending on computers, software, and other information technologies (IT) by government agencies, roughly calculated at \$22 billion in 1991 and \$26.5 billion next year. But the GAO says the actual amounts aren't known since many activities are outside the reporting requirements. Data collection is supposed to improve with the coming fiscal year, when more extensive requirements go into effect. What is clear at present, says the GAO, is that government and IT are consistently plagued by huge cost overruns and inadequate performance once systems are in place. Listed are some of the bigger problem cases—in tax collection, agriculture, weather services, the State Department, etc.—with references to relevant previous GAO reports.

**Government Records: Results of a Search for Records Concerning the 1947 Crash Near Roswell, New Mexico** (GAO/NSIAD-95-187; 20 pp.), another response to the agitations of UFO conspiratorialists, for whom the "Roswell Incident"—the crash of an aerial object in New Mexico nearly 50 years ago—remains a prime case of government concealment of mysterious goings-on out there. Pentagon records, says the GAO, indicate it was a balloon employed in Project MOGUL, described by the GAO as "a highly classified US effort to determine the state of Soviet nuclear weapons research using balloons that carried radar reflectors and acoustic sensors." The inquiry, requested by Rep. Steve Schiff (R-New Mexico), found, however, that some records of the incident were destroyed long ago—a point stressed by Schiff in releasing the report. Distribution was quickly followed by a press release headed "Roswell Crash Remains a Mystery," issued by the Fund for UFO Research, Inc., of Mt. Rainier, Md.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

(Continued on Page 7)



